



1 fm 376/
ATTORNEY DOCKET: 78803.05001
PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re: Nationalization of PCT/GB03/005348

Inventor: George Gallagher

Serial No: 10/538,026

USPTO June 8, 2005
filing date:

International 9 December 2003
Application
Filing Date:

For: INFUSION APPARATUS FOR INFUSION
BAGS

Group Art Unit: 3761

Examiner:
Leslie R. Deak

Charles N. Quinn
Reg. No. 27,223
Fox Rothschild LLP
2000 Market Street, 10th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Tel: 215-299-2135
Fax: 215-299-2150
Email: cquinn@foxrothschild.com
Deposit Account: 50-1943
U.S.P.T.O. Customer No. 34,661

AMENDMENT

Mail Stop: Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Introductory Comments

This paper is submitted in response to a notice of a non-compliant amendment dated 4 March 2008 in which the examiner took the position that applicant's previous paper lacked claim status identifiers for claims 22 through 26.

Applicant regrets the inclusion of unauthorized claim identifiers in applicant's previous paper and requests consideration of the instant paper, and reconsideration of the previous paper, as well as of the preliminary amendment dated 8 June 2005 and the application as it was filed.

The claims have been amended in the instant paper and care has been taken to be sure that the claim status identifiers are authorized. Additionally, arguments have been presented respecting the patentability of the claims in light of the references and a new drawing Figure 11 has been submitted to comport with the recitation of multiple inlets of claims 10 and 11 as previously existing in the application.

Applicant again traverses the rejection of claims 1 through 3, 5 through 7, 9 through 13, 16, 21, 22, 24, 26 and 33, under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentably obvious when considered in view of United States patent 6,409,708 to Wessman when considered in conjunction with United States patent 5,041,087 to Loo, et al. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection based on the amendments to the claims and the arguments presented herein.

Applicant further traverses the rejection of claims 14 through 15, 18 and 20 made on the basis of 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over United States patent 6,409,708 to Wessman when considered in view of United States patent 5,041,087 to Loo, et al., and when further considered in view of United States patent

3,662,752 to Yokoyama. Reconsideration and withdrawal of that rejection of the claims is respectfully solicited.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claim 23 made as being allegedly unpatentably obvious when considering United States patent 6,409,708 to Wessman in view of United States patent 5,041,087 to Loo and further when considering United States patent 4,623,343 to Thompson in view of these patents.

Applicant further traverses the rejection of claim 25 made under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over United States patent 6,409,708 to Wessman in view of United States patent 5,041,087 to Loo, et al. and further in view of United States patent 4,687,473 to Raines.

Applicant further traverses the rejection of claim 17 made under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentably obvious over United States patent 6,409,708 to Wessman in view of United States patent 5,041,087 to Loo, et al. further in view of United States patent 3,662,752 to Yokoyama and further in view of United States patent 4,623,343 to Thompson.

Applicant further traverses the rejection of claim 19 made under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over United States patent 6,409,708 to Wessman in view of United States patent 5,041,087 to Loo, et al. in view of United States patent 3,662,752 to Yokoyama and further in view of United States patent 4,687,473 to Raines.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of all of the rejections of the claims is respectfully solicited in light of the amendments to the claims and arguments presented herein.

Applicant has added new claims to further distinguish the invention over the prior art cited by the examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that when the new claims are considered in light of the prior art, the new claims will be deemed to be allowable over the prior art. Notification of the same is respectfully solicited.